

REMARKS:

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the points raised in the April 8, 2004 non-final Office Action. Upon entry of the above amendments, Claims 1-6 and 12 will have been amended. Claims 1-13 will be pending. No new matter has been introduced. Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, "as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." The Examiner urges, in effect, that the Claim 12 language of "driving means for changing a relative position between the image sensor and the object to be read" is indefinite.

Applicant has amended Claim 12 to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-11 have been rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,969,343 to Nakamura et al. (Nakamura). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite an illumination device including a first diffusion region and:

"a second diffusion region inserted in an optical path of light between the light source and the entrance surface, the light being emitted by the light source."

Applicant respectfully submits that Nakamura neither teaches nor suggests an illumination device having a light guide as recited in independent Claim 1 and, in particular, wherein the light guide includes a second diffusion region inserted in an optical path of light between the light source and the entrance surface. The above amendments to dependent Claims 2-6 are consistent with the above amendments to independent Claim 1. No where is it seen where Nakamura teaches or suggests a second diffusion region inserted in an optical path of light between the light emitters 3 and the end faces 4a and 4b of the guide 1. On this basis, amended Claim 1 is distinguished over the applied prior art of Nakamura. Rejected dependent Claims 2-11 are likewise distinguished over Nakamura for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1. Furthermore, Claims 12 and 13, which likewise depend upon amendment Claim 1 are also distinguished over Nakamura for the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for filing this Amendment and Request for Reconsideration to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4719.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: July 6, 2004

By: 

Brian W. Brown

Registration No. 47,265

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile